REMARKS

Claims 1-6 and 8-14 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1-5 and 9-12 have been amended. Support for the amendments to claim 1-5 can be found, for example, at pg. 10, lines 7-15 of the specification, and support for the amendments to claims 9-12 can be found, for example, at pg. 14, lines 4-14 of the specification. No new matter has been added.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies extended to Applicants' representative by Examiners Price and Thomson during the January 23, 2008 personal interview. Applicants' separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

Claims 1-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,308,225 (hereinafter "Schofield"), in view of "Applied Operating System Concepts" by Silberschatz et al. (hereinafter "Silberschatz"). During the personal interview, the Examiners indicated that claims 6 and 13 were also included in the rejection of claims 1-5, 7-12 and 14 in the September 20, 2007 Office Action. The rejection of claim 7 was rendered moot by the Amendment filed on December 19, 2007. The rejection of claims 1-6 and 9-14 is respectfully traversed.

As discussed during the January 23, 2008 personal interview, Applicants respectfully submit that Schofield and Silberschatz, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the features of the independent claims as presented in the December 19, 2007 Amendment.

However, claims 1-5 and 9-12 have been amended to further clarify the subject matter therein. Specifically, claim 1 has been amended to recite "wherein the software object is capable of realizing the hardware interface independently of the server interface circuit by using only the second interface definition language," and claims 2-5 have been amended similarly. Claim 9 has been amended to recite "wherein the client interface circuit is capable of realizing the interface independently of a server interface circuit by using another interface

-12-

definition language," and claims 10-12 have been amended similarly. As discussed during the January 23, 2008 personal interview, Schofield and Silberschatz fail to teach or suggest at least these features of independent claims 1-5 and 9-12.

Schofield discloses a method for making transport independent distributed object calls. Both a server and a client generate their own respective data structures based on an interface definition and transfer these data structures between one another in a predetermined format that is known to both the client and the server. (See col. 4, lines 11-13).

According to the method of Schofield, object calls are always based on the client-server model. That is, the client always requests a server to implement a function on an object. Thus, the client in Schofield always accesses the interface through the server. Thus, Schofield fails to teach or suggest accessing an interface independently of a server using a different interface definition language. Further, Silberschatz fails to provide that which Schofield lacks.

Thus, Schofield and Silberschatz, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest "wherein the software object is capable of realizing the interface independently of the server interface circuit by using only the second interface definition language," as recited by claim 1, and as similarly recite by claims 3 and 4. Further, Schofield and Silberschatz fail to teach or suggest "wherein the client interface circuit is capable of realizing the interface independently of a server interface circuit by using another interface definition language," as recited by claim 9, and as similarly recited by claims 10-12.

Therefore, independent claims 1-5 and 9-12, and dependent claims 6, 8 and 13-14 which depend therefrom, are also patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Srikant Viswanadham
Registration No. 60,111

JAO:SQV/hjr

Date: February 29, 2008

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION
Please grant any extension
necessary for entry;
Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 15-0461